

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-27 are now in the application. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are amended. Claims 3-5, 11-13 and 19-21 are canceled. Claims 25 -27 are new. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are independent claims.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DeRose et al. (U.S. Patent 6,167,409).

DeRose teaches a client/server computer system (see, for instance, Fig. 1) in which the server processes an existing electronic document already, in an electronic markup format, and actively delivers fragments of that electronic document to a client display in another electronic markup format supported by the client computer. (Col. 5, lines 47 – 59).

The system DeRose teaches is essentially a document retrieval system for displaying electronic documents published in, for instance, SGML format, using a browser that processes another format such as HTML.

Applicants' invention, as embodied in claim 1, is, in contrast, a system for taking a document intended for printed publication and automating creating a representation of that document in a form that is suitable for inclusion in a web-site. Applicants' invention, as embodied in claim 1, is directed to reducing the labor of converting printed publications into a form suitable for electronic distribution, and is of considerable interest to, for instance, public corporations required to produce printed documents such as, but not limited to, annual reports and to distribute an accurate representation of those printed documents to a large number of shareholders. Using applicants' invention a public company can reduce costs by efficiently converting the printed annual report into a form suitable for distribution over a web-site or as an electronic attachment.

In order to clarify this distinction between applicants' invention and the cited prior art, applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate elements of claims 3 -5, and to clarify the meaning and scope of various phrases and words used in applicants' claim 1. Support for these amendments may be found in, for instance, Fig. 2A, Fig. 4, and in the specification as filed at, for instance, page 1, line 19 – page 2, line 5; page 6, lines 7-9; and page 7 line 11 – page 10, line 17.

Amended claim 1 now recites:

A system for creating a static electronic document from a source document having a source content, said system comprising:

a source document, intended for printed publication, comprising sequentially numbered source pages;

a means for inputting a representation of said source document into said computer in the form of a series of source HTML files, each of said source HTML files ~~file~~ corresponding to and being representative of one of said source pages;

a means for creating a page node for each source HTML file and automatically assigning a sequential ordering to each said page node, said sequential ordering relating each of said source HTML files in the same order as said corresponding, sequentially numbered source pages of said source document;

an outliner means for assigning an hierarchical relationship to said page nodes using at least one hierarchical element, whereby at least two hierarchical levels are established, and wherein said hierarchical element comprises a hierarchical substitution code;

a templater means for defining a template, said template specifying characteristics of the visual appearance of the electronic document adjacent to said source HTML file, said template comprising at least one document layout elements, said layout out elements comprising at least one substitution code;

a rendering means for creating final, static enhanced HTML pages, containing said source HTML files, to be displayed, said rendering means employing said template, said hierarchical relationships, said document layout elements and said source ~~content~~ HTML files, and wherein said hierarchical substitution code is automatically rendered by said rendering means as a string sequentially identifying all of said pages nodes having a like hierarchical substitution code, thereby automating creation of an electronic document that is representative of said source document suitable for incorporation in a web-site.

As the Office Action does not show where DeRose teaches converting a source document intended for printing into a series of files corresponding to, and being

representative of, the pages the source document, DeRose does not anticipate applicants' invention of claim 1.

Furthermore, as the Office Action does not show where DeRose teaches a template that specifies characteristics of the visual appearance of the electronic document adjacent to said source HTML file, where the source HTML file is representative of the source page of the document intended for publication, DeRose does not anticipate applicants' invention of claim 1.

Moreover, as the Office Action does not show where DeRose teaches creating a final, static enhanced HTML pages, containing the source HTML files that are representative of the source page of the document intended for publication, DeRose does not anticipate applicants' invention of claim 1.

And, as the Office Action does not show where DeRose teaches using an hierarchical substitution code that is automatically rendered as a string that sequentially identifies all pages that have the same hierarchical substitution code, so as to help in automatically creating an electronic document that is representative of the source document and is suitable for incorporation in a web-site, DeRose does not anticipate applicants' invention of claim 1.

For these reasons, applicants, therefore, request that this rejection be withdrawn and claim 1 allowed.

As corresponding amendments have been made to independent claims 9 and 17, applicants request that the rejection of them be withdrawn and independent claims 9 and 17 be allowed.

As claims 2, 6, 8-10, 14-16, 18 and 22-27 each depend from, and include all the limitations of, a now allowable independent claim, applicants therefore request that these claims be allowed.

Summary

Therefore in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments, favorable reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of all rejections and objections and that claims 1-2, 6- 10, 14-18 and 22-27 be allowed at an early date and the patent allowed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard L. Andrews et al.

By /Roy J. Rosser/

Roy J. Rosser
Agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 53,533
(609) 786-1086 (Direct Dial Tel. No.)

Synnestvedt Lechner and Woodbridge
P. O. Box 592
Princeton, NJ 08542-0592
Tel. (609) 924-3773
Fax (609) 924-1811

Cc: Inventors